

**Minutes of the Southerly Point
Co-operative Multi-Academy Trust
Standards Committee Meeting**

**Thursday 14th October 2021, from 6.00pm
in the Trust Conference Room**

<u>ATTENDING :</u>		
John Aldred		JAI
Donna Bryant		DBr
Carrie Gilmore		CGi
Alan Hinchliffe		AHi
Kristin Pryor		KPr
Chris Webb		CWe
<u>In Attendance</u>		
Richard Lawrence		RLa
Karen Teague		KTe
Kevin Thomas		KTh
<u>APOLOGIES :</u>		
Kate Wilson		KWi
		<u>ACTION</u>
3.	<u>WELCOME AND DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTERESTS</u>	
	The Chair welcomed all those present. Under Declarations of Pecuniary Interests , no additional declarations were forthcoming.	
4.	<u>MINUTES AND MATTERS ARISING</u>	
	<p>The minutes of the previous meeting, on 20th May 2021, were agreed to be an accurate record and were duly signed by the Chair.</p> <p>Matters Arising included updates on:</p> <p>Uniformity of categorisation of social, emotional and mental health needs. PHu / the SENCO Network Group had begun to look at trying to ensure uniformity of categorisation [with agreed definitions] for valid comparison across the Trust but this action was still ongoing. All Headteachers in the Trust were currently involved with SEND training from the National Association for Special Educational Needs [NASEN] entitled 'Every Leader a Leader of SEND', consisting of online fortnightly sessions. One of these sessions, Identification of Need - using national / local benchmarks – had involved comparing percentages in different categories in different regions against national. It was hoped it would be possible to do a similar exercise across the Trust schools and then see if this reflected the national data in this respect.</p> <p>A query was raised as to why there was a shared SENCO role at Mullion School and whether this was a job share. Committee members were informed those internal members of staff appointed to undertake the role only wanted to do so if it was not full time so they both worked on a part time basis but not in a job share. Both were currently doing the National Award for Special Educational Needs Co-ordination [NASENCO] qualification they were required to complete within three years of appointment. The Headteacher was to be asked to share details of what was being done to ensure this provision was robust and that both members of staff had clear expectations of the role.</p> <p>Action: DBr to ask WRa for this information and then share it with the Committee.</p>	<p>PHu</p> <p>DBr</p>

	<p>All Headteachers had been asked to check when their SENCOs took up the role and, where required, that they were appropriately qualified / undergoing the required training.</p> <p>Presentations to the Committee. The presentation by LJo had been postponed until a later point. An additional meeting with a single item agenda for WJe / WRa to present on the secondary curriculum was to be arranged for Thursday 2nd December 2021.</p> <p>All other actions had been completed.</p>	KTe
5.	<p><u>PERFORMANCE AND PROGRESS DATA</u></p>	
	<p>Data presented to Committee members prior to the meeting comprised overviews of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background • Ofsted • Inspection Data Summary Report [IDSR] <p>Primary Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EYFS Profile Assessments by school and against county benchmark • Y1 Phonics Assessments by school and against national benchmark • KS1 Performance Analysis Figures for Reading, Writing and Maths by school [internal Teacher Assessment], including Greater Depth, and with Trust average against national average [2019] - colour coding to indicate Above, Secure, Just Below, Well Below in each element. • KS2 Performance Analysis Figures for Reading, Writing and Maths by school [internal Teacher Assessment], including Greater Depth, and with Trust average against national average [2019] - colour coding to indicate Above, Secure, Just Below, Well Below in each element. • Overview of Data Drop Summer 2021 Figures for Reading, Writing and Maths by school for Y1-Y6 including Average April, Expected [n66], Difference April, Difference December, Difference October, Expected [n65], Difference – again colour coded to indicate the position of each school / year group within each element. • Perceived Impact of Covid on Disadvantaged Pupils – Pupil Premium / Recovery Premium Strategies <p>Secondary Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Stage 4 Attainment 2021, All and Disadvantaged, alongside KS4 Attainment 2020 and benchmarked against national data from 2019 – including English and Maths 9-4, English and Maths 9-5, English Attainment 8 and Maths Attainment 8. • Key Stage 5 Attainment in Quintile for A Level, Applied General and Tech Level from 2017 to 2021 and against national. [2020 data exam board adjusted Centre Assessed Grades and 2021 data Centre Assessed Grades based on rigorous set of exam style assessments. Outcomes benchmarked against 2019 exam results to avoid over-inflation of outcomes. <p><u>Ofsted</u></p> <p>DBr advised Committee members that, three years ago, the focus was around data and so everyone had done a lot of work on this. Now the focus was very much on the curriculum and Covid was not being seen as an acceptable reason for pupils or the curriculum not being back where they were pre-Covid. Headteachers had therefore been asked to focus on high expectations, safeguarding and, in primary, maths and reading in the first instance to ensure these were secure before further work on the wider curriculum.</p> <p>Committee members recognised schools were working in a very challenging context.</p> <p>Discussion was had around whether this would change the way the Standards Committee operated. Points considered included: Data is an indication of what is going on at school or classroom level but is this robust? Who has validated the data? How skilled are people in making assessments? What cross moderation has taken place? Is this part of the staff development programme? Are Executive Leaders confident that what Committee members are seeing is accurate and that data is sound?</p>	

It was agreed the Committee had been and would continue to be proactive in order to reflect changes in Ofsted's expectations. It had already adapted as a Committee, with an increasing focus on curriculum since framework changes. DBr added Executive Leaders and other subject specialists in the Trust were undertaking regular Deep Dive visits that focussed on various curricular areas and this was one opportunity to determine whether the curriculum intent was being reflected in practice.

In addition to this, every school should have at least two School Improvement Partner [SIP] visits a year and the aim was for governors to observe Deep Dive visits to hear the degree of rigour in Executive Leaders' questioning. Governors could then triangulate what had been heard with what the SIP was saying.

Concern was expressed around a lack of governor monitoring visits in some schools. A query was raised as to whether governors had the qualifications or information necessary to undertake monitoring, particularly in terms of the curriculum and teaching / learning, although training sessions on governor monitoring had previously been provided. As there was a risk of too much being taken on the word of school leaders without evidence being sought for what was being stated, DBr advised Committee members a 'High Expectations' rolling pro forma against key aspects of provision had been created. Against each aspect, governors were asked to note not only activities undertaken but also evidence seen, whether / how actions from previous visits had been addressed and any further actions for the school. As well as providing a basis on which Local Governing Bodies might challenge or question Headteachers, this would also be checked at future visits to ensure actions were being moved forward. The pro forma could be adapted for other monitoring activities, such as key aspects of the School Improvement Plan. Governors had a delegated responsibility for standards at school level so it was important for the Trust Board / Standards Committee to ensure they were asking the right questions. Governors had to be clear on their role in the overall process and mechanisms had to be in place to ensure they were getting a complete picture, based on evidence.

Key documents for governors to reference were the School Evaluation Form [SEF], the most recent SIP visit report and the latest Ofsted report as these would indicate which areas required attention. If they were familiar with these, governors could then check any issues identified there were being addressed within the School Development Plan / school practice and were reflected in Executive Leader visits, data, etc.

Headteachers / Chairs of Governors should flag if governor monitoring was not happening and make sure the monitoring reports were placed in the shared Google area for the information of Local Governing Bodies and their Linked Trustees.

Executive Leaders undertook a risk assessment exercise at the start of each year to look at outcomes, context and processes and rag rated these.

More thought would be given to this but, if clear systems were in place, Executive Leaders and Trustees will have done all they could reasonably do to guide the behaviours and processes of governors. Linked Trustees could also be a really positive and constructive influence on Local Governing Bodies by instilling good practice around monitoring, advising governors around where to go for answers to questions and so on.

Primary Standards

Q. Are the lower achievers in EYFS very concerning?

A. This is down to the data being skewed by small pupil numbers in one instance. The other is more concerning but this is being addressed and the Linked Trustee is aware of it. EYFS has been homed in on during some Ofsted visits so this needs to be up to standard. Staff have been asked to consider: is what is happening in the classroom to move pupils forward in their learning and is this robust?

Committee members were informed the Executive Leader included data / outcomes in Headteacher Performance Management sessions so this was being triangulated. Chairs of Governors, who attended these sessions, should then take any challenges back to the school and follow up on these.

Discussion was briefly had around when data came out and whether it might be possible or necessary for this to be discussed by the Committee prior to Local Governing Body

meetings. However, it was recognised there was no ideal way for this to happen and that, after trialling a number of systems, the current system of meetings was the most effective yet.

Q. Why is there individual choice of phonics schemes and not one scheme across the Trust?

A. Read Write Inc includes 6 stages of phonics so 6 sets of children are taught by 6 members of staff at once so the school has to have enough staff. It is also costly to set up and there is an ongoing licence fee each year. It is the quality of delivery that is important and, where schools have sufficient staff and breakout spaces, this can work well. It is also the only complete scheme on the market to be approved. Other schools use different schemes, such as Letters and Sounds, and outcomes are currently comparable in our schools.

Headteachers make a decision based on what they know about their own schools. Ofsted cannot express a preference but are clear that RWI is a complete package that ensures the books have exact phoneme grapheme correspondence and allows pupils to experience success rather than struggle. This is the standard schools are being judged against. RWI is highly prescriptive and structured.

Schools are not obliged to opt for a synthetic phonics scheme till April and some schemes are awaiting approval so Headteachers do not want to opt in too quickly and invest a great deal of money until other schemes have also been approved, approved, when a more informed choice can be made. One school already inspected is using Letters and Sounds and was not found wanting because staff had gone through and identified all schemes needed to test to be approved before going back and plugging any gaps to ensure what they were doing was robust.

Q. Are schools falling below the benchmark using the same scheme?

A. No. There is no direct correlation between the scheme used and pupil outcomes.

Essentially, where schools do not conform they will need to justify why not and their practice will have to be good enough to support this justification.

Q. In Key Stage 1, is sufficient work being done in terms of Greater Depth?

A. There is a case to say that teachers were being more conservative in their judgements as work completed while pupils were at home was not as thorough as work completed in class. Ofsted will expect Headteachers and governors to be able to state what is being done in terms of challenge, extension and high expectations, however.

Q. If the gap is widening for Pupil Premium children, in writing for example, is additional work being done as a result?

A. Pupil Premium and Recovery have now merged into one document so schools will be addressing this in their plans and should be feeding back on work done in this respect.

Q. How much work should be focused on Greater Depth and how much on Expected Standard?

A. We would want to see a good percentage of pupils at Expected Standard but work on Greater Depth is not impeding on the numbers reaching Expected Standard, as it is about aiming high and supporting others in moving towards it.

Additional information was sought from a school that appeared to be a lower performer in terms of attainment. The cohort was small and none of the pupils achieved strong attainment. However, their in year progress was robust. The low attainment was a product of lockdown and a lack of scaffolding at home. This reduced the percentage at Greater Depth.

Committee members were assured Executive Leaders would be having conversations with Headteachers around all these matters.

Summer Data Drop

RLa advised Committee members the picture from the summer data drop had not been dissimilar to the usual picture in terms of patterns.

A book review of work from Year 2 / Year 6 pupils across the Trust had been undertaken at a recent Heads' Group meeting. Headteachers had been asked to make checks in each of their schools around the following key areas:

- Quantity of work
- Quality of work
- Presentation – pride in work that reflects high expectations
- Level of challenge
- Is all work recorded in books – if not, where is evidence of this moving children forward in their learning?
- Can you explain why what you are doing is right?
- What will you do next as a result of what you have seen from other schools? What have you taken away as an action point?

Q. When Deep Dives are undertaken, are teacher assessments then checked against these?

A. These are primarily about curriculum development and the quality of teaching rather than going back to data but this could be done to ascertain the impact of the curriculum changes.

Committee members were advised it was inevitable there would be some minor variations in ratings between schools. Moderation was the most useful means of helping accuracy. Schools used NFER tests or independent assessment tasks, along with moderation within and between schools, to inform teacher judgements. Historically there had been moderation across the Trust schools and, while this had not been possible while the integrity of bubble groups had to be maintained, that should be in place this term.

There had been moves towards a consistent approach in some areas. It was pointed out that many schools were moving towards the same scheme in maths. Where an approach was not working despite the school having had an opportunity to address this, it could be necessary for Executive Leaders to step in and determine a different approach.

A piece of work was currently being done around agreeing core concepts for primary and secondary teachers in various curricular areas. The curriculum was really important but pedagogy had to be sufficiently strong to lead pupils in their learning journey. The Curriculum Working Groups would provide greater consistency in each of the curricular areas, and having strong practitioners working with less experienced practitioners should also lead to a greater consistency in curriculum and pedagogy, but consistency could only be achieved with time to build coherence.

Secondary Standards

KS4

RLa reminded the Committee that the methodologies for deciding on Centre Assessed Grades had been agreed by a sub-group of the Committee in April.

KTh asked it be minuted that both of the secondary schools deserved credit for how they had managed the Centre Assessed Grades. They had done a very good job, been incredibly fair and been very honest with their appraisals. This had been reflected in the extremely low number of appeals over numerous exams.

It was noted the disadvantaged gap was still there, as this had been compounded by the lockdown, but Headteachers were mindful of this.

A query arose as to whether it might have been helpful if Committee members had been able to see the 2019 data as well, just to provide more context, though it was recognised any direct comparison would be difficult given the circumstances.

KS 5

Committee members observed the results were a real achievement. Although this was not validated data, the last validated data had shown an improvement year on year, with an uplift in outcomes. This had been used as a basis for the judgements this year. As good results would also help attract good numbers, these outcomes were very positive.

See also Confidential Notes.

6.	<u>BEHAVIOUR AND ATTENDANCE DATA</u>	
	<p>Data presented to Committee members prior to the meeting included:</p> <p>Migration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migration in, by school and Trust • Migration out, by school and Trust • Migration to – an SPCMAT school; another school in county; a school out of county; to EHE <p>Exclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number for year 01.09.2020 to 31.08.2021 by school <p>Pupil Attendance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance figures as of 06.10.2021 by school and against national comparators <p>Wellbeing</p> <p>Committee members were reminded one of the proxy measures for wellbeing was the number of new and open CAMHS [Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service] referrals. A more effective measure was being explored but here, for a measure on the scale of well-being support for children, the schools were asked to return data showing the number of children who had been referred for or were in receipt of support from CAMHS for the period 1st September 2020 to 31st August 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary by School – All; FSM; SEN K, having additional support; SEN S, with statement, and SEN E, with EHCP; Children in Care • Secondary by School - All; FSM; SEN K, having additional support; SEN S, with statement, and SEN E, with EHCP; Children in Care <p>Staff Sickness Absence - By School and Trust</p> <p>Figures for the period 1st September 2020 to 31st August 2021, by teachers and support staff, included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of staff • Number of changes • Sickness absence % • Staff absent for more than 5 days of sickness • Staff absent for more than 5 periods of sickness • Staff absent for more than 10 days of sickness <p>The following data was also supplied for the period 1st September 2020 to 31st August 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Safeguarding Referrals – Primary and Secondary • LADO Referrals – Primary and Secondary • Reported Accidents - Primary and Secondary • Formal Complaints - Primary and Secondary • Racist Incidents - Primary and Secondary • Diversity Incidents - Primary and Secondary <p>Migration</p> <p>There had been a lot of churn during lockdown and more fluctuation than usual in this respect. Elective Home Education remained a worry, as pupils returning to school were missing out on so much before coming back.</p> <p>Pupil Attendance</p> <p>The number of pupils taking term time holidays was relatively low but it was suggested the rate could start to increase as travel became easier, even though approval was only granted in exceptional cases.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the number of Covid cases was again rising in schools. Vaccination teams had been diminished due to Covid and so were yet to visit the secondary schools. Moreover, a lack of agency staff to cover staff absent due to contracting Covid was also impacting on schools.</p> <p>Wellbeing</p> <p>Committee members were advised the figures for CAMHS referrals had been artificially</p>	

	<p>inflated by Primary Mental Health Support Worker referrals so that should be borne in mind when reviewing this data.</p> <p>Staff Absence</p> <p><u>Q. Are the levels of staff absence considered worrying?</u></p> <p>A. Some of the figures are reflecting Covid and some are reflecting minor inconsistencies in recording support staff attendance, again exacerbated by Covid. Where there is a potential concern, however, this is being monitored and if the level increases we will refocus on this.</p> <p>Formal Complaints</p> <p>Whilst there had only been five formal complaints across the primary schools, this was high for the Trust.</p> <p>Diversity Incidents</p> <p>Although it was not good to see any diversity issues being recorded, it was nevertheless good to note these were being recognised and identified by schools, and that work was being done to address this.</p> <p>Additional questions were sought but none were forthcoming at that time.</p> <p>See also Confidential Notes.</p>	
7.	<u>RISK REGISTER REVIEW</u>	
	<p>DBr talked through the relevant elements of the Full Risk Register shared with Committee members prior to the meeting. Matters presented and discussed included:</p> <p>Section 1.4, around failure to identify exceptional results [high or low] in a cohort / year group / subject early enough to make a difference. In light of recent feedback, it was proposed this risk be re-categorised and nuanced to include failure to identify with sufficient precision where schools were not performing at a high enough level to achieve effective outcomes for pupils and the Action be moved to Treat.</p> <p>Section 1.6, around failure to ensure that Information Technology in the Trust schools was maintained to the highest standard. A great deal of work had been put into this but, as the various aspects were being unpicked, a significant number of legacy issues were coming to light. Progress was definitely being made – a central server had been built and schools were being moved across to this, and the filtering was working well. Work on refining cyber security was still being done so it was proposed the Action remain as Treat.</p> <p>Any further questions were sought but none were forthcoming at that time.</p> <p>Committee members agreed the above proposals and the Risk Register was to be updated accordingly.</p>	DBr / RLa
8.	<u>ANY OTHER BUSINESS</u>	
	<p>DBr briefly outlined the nature and scope of recent Ofsted inspections within the Trust but discussion around outcomes was to take place at the upcoming meeting of the full Trust Board.</p> <p>There were no further matters to be raised at this time so the Chair thanked everyone for attending and drew the meeting to a close at 8.15pm.</p>	
9.	<u>DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS</u>	
	<p>The next meeting of the Trust Standards Committee was to take place on Thursday 20th January 2022, from 6.00pm, in the Trust Conference Room.</p> <p>Thereafter, meetings would take place on:</p> <p>Thursday 23rd June 2022, from 6.00pm.</p>	

Chair's Signature _____ Date _____